



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,277	06/07/2001	Brian S. Forbes	INTL-0577-US (P11464)	8806

7590 06/10/2004
Timothy N. Trop
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 KATY FWY, STE 100
HOUSTON, TX 77024-1805

EXAMINER

CONNOLLY, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2115

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/876,277

Applicant(s)

FORBES ET AL.

Examiner

Mark Connolly

Art Unit

2115

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is believed that the path between the "supply voltage and ground" was meant to read "supply voltage plane and ground."

Appropriate correction is required.

2. Claims 24 and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claims 24 and 25 should be dependent on claims 23 and 19 respectively. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art [AAPA] in view of Suzuki et al [Suzuki] US Pat No 6278598.

5. Referring to claim 1, the AAPA teaches the invention substantially including a supply voltage plane not receiving power from a power resource of the computer in response to a predetermined sleep state [page 1 lines 19-21]. The lowest power sleep state is interpreted as the predetermined sleep state.

The AAPA does not teach:

a. in response to the computer being in a predetermined sleep state, coupling a load to conduct current from a supply voltage plane of the computer to ground

Art Unit: 2115

b. in response to the computer being in a predetermined state other than the predetermined sleep state, decoupling the load so that the load does not conduct current from the supply voltage plane to ground

In summary, the AAPA does not teach grounding the power plane when the power supply is disconnected from the computer and removing the power plane from ground when the power supply is reconnected to the computer.

Suzuki teaches grounding a power plane while a power supply is disconnected from the computer [col. 4 lines 4-34]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the AAPA system to ground the power plane when the power supply is disconnected from the computer because it will “prevent the occurrence of the operational error due to residual voltage at the reactivation of the switch circuit” [col. 4 lines 29-31]. It is interpreted in the AAPA-Suzuki system that the power supply is reconnected once the computer wakes from the predetermined sleep state. Furthermore it is obvious that the power plane would be removed from ground once the computer awoke from the predetermined sleep state so that the power being supplied from the power source could be applied to the computer and its devices rather than being grounded out.

6. Referring to claim 2, waking from the predetermined sleep state is interpreted as a higher power state than a sleep state since the predetermined sleep state is the lowest power sleep state as described above.

7. Referring to claim 3, the AAPA teaches that there are higher power sleep states which the computer can enter [page 1 lines 11-18].

Art Unit: 2115

8. Referring to claim 4, the AAPA teaches a range of sleep states that remove the power supply from the computer [page 1 lines 16-21].

9. Referring to claim 5, the AAPA teaches that the range of sleep states comprise the lowest power sleep states [page 1 lines 16-21].

10. Referring to claim 6, the AAPA teaches that peripherals connected to the computer can contribute power to the power plane [page 1 lines 21-23]. It is inherent in the AAPA-Suzuki system that when the power plane is grounded, power would flow towards ground and thus inherently control the voltage level on the supply voltage plane.

11. Referring to claims 7 and 8, Suzuki teaches activating and deactivating a switch to establish and remove a path between the supply voltage plane and ground [103 Fig. 2].

12. Referring to claim 9, it is obvious that in the AAPA-Suzuki system that the power supply must be coupled to the computer when awaking from the predetermined sleep state so that power can be supplied to the computer.

13. Referring to claim 10, the AAPA teaches that the power is supplied through a voltage regulator [page 1 lines 19-21].

14. Referring to claims 11-26, these are rejected on the same basis as set forth hereinabove. The AAPA and Suzuki teach the method and therefore teach the system performing the method.

Conclusion

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Connolly whose telephone number is (703) 305-7849. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-5PM (except every first Friday).

Art Unit: 2115


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas C Lee can be reached on (703) 305-9717. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mark Connolly
Examiner
Art Unit 2115

mc
June 3, 2004




THOMAS LEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100